arXiv:1510.03493v1 [math.CO] 13 Oct 2015

# Homotopy type of intervals of the second higher Bruhat orders

Thomas McConville

October 14, 2015

**Abstract**

The higher Bruhat order is a poset of cubical tilings of a cyclic zonotope whose covering relations are cubical flips. For a 2-dimensional zonotope, the higher Bruhat order is a poset on commutation classes of reduced words for the longest element of a type A Coxeter system. For this case, we prove that the noncontractible intervals are in natural correspondence with the zonogonal tilings of a zonogon. Our proof uses some tools developed by Felsner and Weil to show that the two standard orderings on the rhombic tilings of a zonogon are identical.

## 1 Introduction

The higher Bruhat order is a poset structure on the cubical tilings of a cyclic zonotope, ordered by upward flips (Figure 1). Alternatively, the higher Bruhat order $B(n,d)$ is the poset of consistent subsets, defined as follows.

Let $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ denote the $(d+1)$-element subsets of $\{1,\dots,n\}$. We say a subset $X$ of $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is *closed* if $I\cup\{i,j\}\in X$ and $I\cup\{j,k\}\in X$ implies $I\cup\{i,k\}\in X$ for $I\in\binom{[n]}{d-1}$, $i,j,k\in[n]-I$, $i<j<k$. For instance, $\{123,134\}$ is not a closed subset of $\binom{[4]}{3}$ since it contains $\{1\}\cup\{2,3\}$ and $\{1\}\cup\{3,4\}$ but not $\{1\}\cup\{2,4\}$. A subset $X$ of $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is *consistent* (or *biclosed* or *clopen*) if both $X$ and $\binom{[n]}{d+1}-X$ are closed. The consistent sets are ordered by *single-step inclusion*; that is $X\le Y$ holds if there exists a sequence $X=X_0\subseteq\cdots\subseteq X_t=Y$ of consistent sets for which $|X_i-X_{i-1}|=1$ for all $i$. In particular, $B(n,1)$ may be identified with the weak order on the symmetric group on $[n]$. The second higher Bruhat order $B(n,2)$ defines an ordering on the commutation-equivalence classes of reduced words for the longest element of the symmetric group on $[n]$.

Introduced by Manin and Schechtman, the higher Bruhat orders have many equivalent interpretations, including single-element extensions of an alternating matroid, cubical tilings of a cyclic zonotope, and "admissible" permutations of $d$-subsets of



Figure 1: (left) $B(4,2)$ as a poset of rhombic tilings of a zonogon. (right) $B(5,2)$

$[n]$ up to a suitable equivalence; see [17, Theorem 4.1], [9], or [8]. The higher Bruhat orders have appeared in a wide variety of contexts, including higher categories and Zamolodchikov's tetrahedral equation [8], soliton solutions of the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili equation [5], and the multidimensional cube recurrence [7].

We consider the homotopy type of intervals of $B(n,2)$. Our main result is that every interval of $B(n,2)$ is either contractible or homotopy equivalent to a sphere. As usual, the topology associated to a poset $P$ is that of its order complex, the simplicial complex of chains $x_0 < \cdots < x_m$ of elements of $P$. If $P$ is a bounded poset, we usually consider the order complex of its *proper part* $P_{\text{prop}}$, the same poset with those bounds removed. As the Möbius invariant of $P$ is equal to the reduced Euler characteristic of the order complex of $P_{\text{prop}}$, the homotopy types of intervals of a poset completely determines the Möbius function. This is a useful point of view, as many techniques for determining Möbius functions have homotopy analogues [2].

Consistent subsets of $\binom{[n]}{3}$ are in natural bijection with simple pseudoline arrangements with $n$ pseudolines, cyclically ordered at infinity. We also identify one of the two infinite regions bounded by 1 and $n$ as the "bottom" region. The consistent set associated to a simple pseudoline arrangement is the set of inversions of the arrangement, where $\{i < j < k\} \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ is an *inversion* if the crossing of the pseudolines $i$ and $k$ occurs below $j$. The inversion set of the pseudoline arrangement in Figure 2 is $\{124, 134, 135, 234, 235\}$. Simple pseudoline arrangements also correspond to rhombic tilings of a zonogon via the Bohne-Dress Theorem ([4],[13]) as demonstrated in Figure 2.

A (non-simple) arrangement of pseudolines may have crossings involving more than two pseudolines. The set of simple arrangements that may be obtained by resolving




Figure 2: A rhombic tiling of a zonogon with its associated pseudoline arrangement.

these crossings forms a closed interval of $B(n, 2)$, which we call a *facial interval*. For example, the arrangement in Figure 3 has two non-simple crossings that may be resolved in 16 ways, which is an interval of $B(6, 2)$. One such resolution is the arrangement of Figure 2.

Rambau proved that that the proper part of $B(n, d)$ is homotopy equivalent to an $(n - d - 2)$-sphere as an application of his Suspension Lemma [11]. Reiner extended this by showing that any facial interval of $B(n, d)$ is homotopy equivalent to a sphere [12, Conjecture 6.9]. He conjectured that every other interval is contractible. As $B(n, 1)$ is isomorphic to the weak order of the symmetric group on $[n]$, the conjectured homotopy type of intervals was already verified by Björner for $B(n, 1)$ [1]. We prove Reiner's conjecture for $B(n, 2)$.

**Theorem 1.1** *An interval of $B(n, 2)$ is non-contractible if and only if it is facial.*

Björner's computation of the homotopy type of intervals of $B(n, 1)$ relies on the lattice property of the weak order. Indeed, the weak order is a crosscut-simplicial lattice, which means for any interval $(x, y)$, the join of any proper subset of atoms of $(x, y)$ is not equal to $y$. Hence, every interval is either contractible or homotopy equivalent to a sphere by the Crosscut Lemma.

Although $B(n, 2)$ is not a lattice when $n \geq 6$, it is "close enough" to being a lattice that a similar argument may be applied. For any poset $P$, the order complex of $P$




Figure 3: A zonogonal tiling with its associated non-simple pseudoline arrangement.

is homotopy equivalent to the order complex of $P_{\text{nonc}}$, the subposet of elements $X$ for which $\{Y \in P : \ Y < X\}$ is non-contractible [15, Proposition 6.1]. We prove that if $P$ is any open interval of $B(n,2)$, then either $P_{\text{nonc}}$ is the proper part of a Boolean lattice, or $P_{\text{nonc}}$ contains an element $X$ such that $X \vee Y$ exists in $P_{\text{nonc}}$ for all $Y \in P_{\text{nonc}}$. The latter intervals are contractible by a join-contraction argument.

By Theorem 1.1, there is a poset isomorphism between the non-contractible intervals of $B(n,2)$ ordered by inclusion and the lifting space of a central arrangement of $n$ lines, ordered by weak maps. Using some general techniques in poset topology, this isomorphism implies that the lifting space is homotopy equivalent to a sphere of dimension $n-3$. In general, the lifting space of an alternating matroid is known to be homotopy equivalent to a sphere ([14] Theorem 4.12); see Figure 1. Reiner's conjecture would provide an alternate proof of this result.

The paper is organized as follows. Some topological preliminaries are given in Section 2. We prove some results on general higher Bruhat orders in Section 3. Wiring diagrams are defined in Section 4 along with other results specific to the second higher Bruhat orders. Finally, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in Section 5.

## 2 Poset Topology

We establish some notation and recall a few fundamental results on the topology of posets, following Björner [2]. A *poset* $P$ is a set with a reflexive, antisymmetric, transitive binary relation. We will tacitly assume that a given poset is finite unless specified otherwise. A *lower bound* (*upper bound*) is an element $\hat{0}$ ($\hat{1}$) such that $\hat{0} \leq x$ ($x \leq \hat{1}$) for all $x \in P$. We say $P$ is *bounded* if it has both an upper and lower bound. A poset is a *lattice* if every pair of elements $x, y \in P$ has a least upper bound $x \vee y$ and greatest lower bound $x \wedge y$.

If $P$ has an upper or a lower bound, then the *proper part* $\overline{P}$ is the same poset with those bounds removed. Given $x \leq y$, the *closed interval* $[x, y]$ (*open interval* $(x, y)$) is the set of $z \in P$ such that $x \leq z \leq y$ ($x < z < y$).

The *order complex* $\Delta(P)$ of a poset $P$ is the abstract simplicial complex with vertex set $P$ and simplices $\{x_0, \ldots, x_d\}$ where $x_0 < \cdots < x_d$ is a chain of $P$. We define the topology of a poset to be that of its order complex.

The *Möbius function* $\mu : \mathrm{Int}(P) \to \mathbb{Z}$ is the unique function on the closed intervals of $P$ such that

$$\mu([x,y]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ \displaystyle\sum_{z \in [x,y]} \mu([x,z]) = 0 & \text{if } x < y \end{cases}$$

The value of $\mu([x, y])$ is the reduced Euler characteristic of $\Delta((x, y))$. Many techniques for computing Möbius functions have homotopy counterparts.

**Lemma 2.1 ([15] Proposition 6.1)** *If $x \in P$ such that $P_{<x}$ or $P_{>x}$ is contractible, then $P$ is homotopy equivalent to $P - \{x\}$.*

Let $x_1 < \cdots < x_N$ be a linear extension of $P$. By deleting elements $x_i$ such that $P_{>x_i}$ is contractible in the order of the linear extension, we deduce the following result.

**Lemma 2.2** *$P$ is homotopy equivalent to the subposet*

$$\{x \in P : \ P_{>x} \text{ is non-contractible } \}$$

.

We let $P_{\mathrm{nonc}}$ be the subposet of Lemma 2.2. Replacing $P_{>x}$ with $P_{<x}$, a dual form of this lemma also holds, but we will not need it.

Let $\mathrm{Int}(P)$ be the poset of closed intervals of $P$, ordered by inclusion. It is known that $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(P)$ is homeomorphic to the suspension of $\overline{P}$. This was originally proved by Walker [16, Theorem 6.1(c)] by specifying a "subdivision map" between geometric realizations of their order complexes. An alternative proof was given in [10, Lemma 3.3.10] by constructing the order complex of $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(P)$ from the suspension of $\overline{P}$ by a sequence of edge-stellations.

For a bounded poset $P$, let $\mathrm{Int}_{\mathrm{nonc}}(P)$ be the poset of closed intervals $[x,y]$ for which $(x,y)$ is non-contractible, ordered by inclusion. We note that if $x=y$ or $x \lessdot y$, then $\Delta((x,y))$ is an empty complex, which is non-contractible.

**Lemma 2.3** *$\overline{\mathrm{Int}}_{\mathrm{nonc}}(P)$ is homotopy equivalent to* $\mathrm{susp}(\overline{P})$.

*Proof:* From the above discussion, it suffices to show that $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}_{\mathrm{nonc}}(P)$ is homotopy equivalent to $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(P)$.

Let $I_1,\ldots,I_N$ be a linear extension of $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(P)$. For $i \geq 0$, let

$$Q_i = \{I_j :\ j \leq i \text{ or } I_j \text{ is non-contractible}\}.$$

Then $Q_N = \overline{\mathrm{Int}}(P)$ and $Q_0 = \overline{\mathrm{Int}}_{\mathrm{nonc}}(P)$. If $I_i$ is non-contractible then $Q_{i-1} = Q_i$.

Let $i \geq 0$ and assume $I_i$ is contractible. Since $I_j \subseteq I_i$ implies $j \leq i$, the subposet $(Q_i)_{<I_i}$ is equal to $\overline{\mathrm{Int}}(I_i)$. The latter is the suspension of a contractible complex, so it is contractible. Hence, $Q_{i-1} \simeq Q_i$. The result now follows by induction. ∎

# 3 Higher Bruhat orders

For $n,d \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ denote the set of $(d+1)$-element subsets of $[n]=\{1,\ldots,n\}$. A subset $X$ of $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is *closed* if for $I \in \binom{[n]}{d-1},\ i,j,k \in [n]\setminus I,\ i<j<k$,

$$\text{if } I\cup\{i,j\} \in X \text{ and } I\cup\{j,k\} \in X \text{ then } I\cup\{i,k\} \in X.$$

For $X \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$, we let $\overline{X}$ be the smallest closed set containing $X$. If $X$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ and $P \subseteq [n]$, the *restriction* $X|_P$ of $X$ to $P$ is the subfamily of subsets contained in $P$. A subset $X$ of $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is *consistent* if $X$ and $\binom{[n]}{d+1}\setminus X$ are both closed. Equivalently, $X$ is consistent if for any $(d+2)$-subset $P=\{i_0,\ldots,i_{d+1}\},\ i_0<\cdots<i_{d+1}$,

$$X|_P = \begin{cases} \{P\setminus i_{d+1},\ldots,P\setminus i_t\} & \text{for some } t, OR \\ \{P\setminus i_t,\ldots,P\setminus i_0\} & \text{for some } t \end{cases}.$$

The *higher Bruhat order* $B(n,d)$ is the poset of consistent subsets of $\binom{[n]}{d+1}$ ordered by *single-step inclusion*; that is, $X \leq Y$ if there exists a sequence of consistent subsets $X_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq X_t$ such that $X=X_0,\ Y=X_t$ and $|X_i \setminus X_{i-1}|=1$ for all $i$. The same set ordered by ordinary inclusion is denoted $B_{\subseteq}(n,d)$. The posets $B(n,d)$ and $B_{\subseteq}(n,d)$ are both graded with rank function $X \mapsto |X|$ ([17] Theorem 4.1(G)).

When $d=1$, $B(n,1)$ is isomorphic to the weak order on the symmetric group, and the two orders $B(n,1)$ and $B_{\subseteq}(n,1)$ coincide. The weak order $B(n,1)$ is a lattice where the join of $X$ and $Y$ is $\overline{X\cup Y}$. If $d \geq 2$, the poset $B(n,d)$ may not be a lattice; in particular, $B(6,2)$ is not a lattice ([17] Theorem 4.4). Ziegler proved that $B(n,d)=B_{\subseteq}(n,d)$ when $n-d \leq 4$, but $B(8,3)$ is weaker than $B_{\subseteq}(8,3)$ ([17]

Theorem 4.5). In fact, his example in $B(8,3)$ shows that $\overline{X \cup Y}$ need not be the join of $X, Y \in B(n,d)$ even if $\overline{X \cup Y}$ is consistent.

For $X, Y \in B(n,d)$, if $X \subseteq Y$ we define the *ascent set*

$$\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y) = \{I \in Y \setminus X : \ X \cup \{I\} \in B(n,d)\}.$$

If $Y = \hat{1}$, we write $\mathrm{Asc}(X)$ for $\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$.

**Lemma 3.1** *Fix $X \in B(n,d)$. The ascent set $\mathrm{Asc}(X)$ decomposes as the disjoint union $\mathrm{Asc}(X) = A_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup A_N$ where*

1. *$A_t = \{\{a_{t1} < \cdots < a_{t,d+1}\}, \{a_{t2} < \cdots < a_{t,d+2}\}, \ldots, \{a_{t,r_t} < \cdots < a_{t,d+r_t}\}\}$ (i.e. $A_t$ is the set of contiguous intervals in the set $\{a_{t1}, \ldots, a_{t,r_t+d}\} \subseteq [n]$), and*
2. *if $I \in A_s, \ J \in A_t$, $s \neq t$ then $|I \cap J| < d$.*

*Proof:* We first show that any ascent $I \in \mathrm{Asc}(X)$ shares $d$ elements with at most two other ascents of $X$. Suppose $I, J \in \mathrm{Asc}(X)$ such that $|I \cap J| = d$ with $I < J$ in lexicographic order. The restriction $X|_{I \cup J}$ is an element of $B(|I \cup J|, d)$ with two ascents, so it must be the bottom element. Consequently, the $I$ ($J$) is the lex-minimal (lex-maximal) $(d+1)$-subset of $I \cup J$.

Now suppose $J' \in \mathrm{Asc}(X), \ J' \neq J$ such that $J' > I$ in lexicographic order and $|J' \cap I| = d$. Then $J'$ is the lex-maximal $(d+1)$-subset of $I \cup J'$ by the above argument. But, $|J \cap J'| = d$ and $J, J'$ are not at opposite ends of their $(d+1)$-packet, a contradiction.

We have now established that for any $I \in \mathrm{Asc}(X)$, there is at most one $J > I$ in lexicographic order for which $|I \cap J| = d$. By similar reasoning, there is at most one $L < I$ with $|I \cap L| = d$. Thus, $\mathrm{Asc}(X)$ decomposes into chains $I_1^t < I_2^t < \cdots < I_{m_t}^t$ where $|I_i^t \cap I_{i+1}^t| = d$ and all other intersections have cardinality strictly less than $d$. ∎

**Lemma 3.2** *If $X \in B(n,d)$, then $X \cap \overline{\mathrm{Asc}(X)} = \emptyset$.*

*Proof:* The ascent set $\mathrm{Asc}(X)$ is a subset of $\binom{[n]}{d} \setminus X$, and the latter set is closed. Hence, $X \cap \overline{\mathrm{Asc}(X)}$ is empty. ∎

# 4 The second higher Bruhat order

A *wiring diagram* is a collection of *wires*, continuous piecewise linear curves $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, satisfying the following conditions.

- The projection of $C_i$ onto the first coordinate is bijective.

- The wires are in order $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ top-to-bottom, sufficiently far to the right.
- Distinct wires $C_i, C_j$ cross at a unique point.
- All crossings are transverse.

We shall further assume that the wiring diagram is *simple*, meaning there are no common intersections among three or more wires. In particular, each wire $C_i$ determines a permutation $\pi_i = a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}$ of $[n] \setminus i$ where if $r < s$ then the first coordinate of $C_i \cap C_{a_r}$ is less than that of $C_i \cap C_{a_s}$. Two wiring diagrams are considered equivalent if they determine the same sequence of wire permutations $(\pi_i)_{i \in [n]}$.

For $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$, if the crossing of $C_i$ and $C_k$ is below (above) $C_j$, then $\{i, j, k\}$ is an *inversion triple* (*non-inversion triple*). The map taking a wiring diagram to its set of inversion triples defines a bijection between equivalence classes of simple wiring diagrams with $n$ wires and consistent subsets of $\binom{[n]}{3}$. A *block* is a set of non-inversion triples of the form $\{\{i_j, i_{j+1}, i_{j+2}\} : \ j \in [m]\}$, where $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{m+2} \leq n$.

For distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$, the piece $S^j_{ik}$ of $C_j$ between $C_i \cap C_j$ and $C_k \cap C_j$ is called a *segment* of $C_j$. If $\{i, j, k\}$ is a non-inversion triple, $i < j < k$, then the *floor* of $\{i, j, k\}$ is the segment $S^j_{ik}$. The *floor of a block* $\mathcal{I}$ is the union of the floors of elements of $\mathcal{I}$. A floor is *elementary* if its interior is not intersected by any other wire. The *height* of a non-inversion triple $\{i, j, k\}$, denoted $\mathrm{ht}(\{i, j, k\})$, is the number of wires that pass below the segment $S^j_{ik}$. If a block $\mathcal{I}$ has an elementary floor, then all of its elements have the same height, which we denote $\mathrm{ht}(\mathcal{I})$.

**Proposition 4.1 ([6])** *Let $W$ be a simple wiring diagram with inversion set $X$. Let $Y \in B(n, 2)$ such that $X \subsetneq Y$.*

1. *There exists an element of $Y - X$ with an elementary floor in $W$. ([6] Lemma 2.2)*
2. *Among those elements of $Y - X$ with an elementary floor, if $I$ is of maximum height, then $X \cup \{I\}$ is consistent. In particular, $\mathrm{Asc}(X, Y)$ is nonempty. ([6] Lemma 2.3)*

**Corollary 4.2** *The second higher Bruhat order $B(n, 2)$ is ordered by inclusion; that is, $B(n, 2) = B_{\subseteq}(n, 2)$ as posets.*

Given $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$, let $[\mathcal{I}]$ denote the union $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I$.

**Lemma 4.3** *Let $X \in B(n, 2)$ have wiring diagram $W$. If $\mathcal{I}$ is a block with an elementary floor in $W$, then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is not consistent if and only if there exists a wire $p$ intersecting the segments $S^{i_0}_{i_1, i_m}$ and $S^{i_m}_{i_0, i_{m-1}}$ where $[\mathcal{I}] = \{i_0 < \cdots < i_m\}$.*




Figure 4: Wire $p$ intersects $S^{i_0}_{i_1 i_{m-1}}$ so $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I} \setminus \{i_{m-2}, i_{m-1}, i_m\}}$ is not consistent.

*Proof:* Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a block with an elementary floor in $W$, and let $p \in [n] - [\mathcal{I}]$. If $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is consistent, then for $i \in [\mathcal{I}]$ the words $\pi_i$ have the elements of $[\mathcal{I}] \setminus i$ flipped with the other letters in the same relative order. Hence, $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is consistent if and only if every wire in $[n] - [\mathcal{I}]$ does not intersect any segment $S^k_{ij}$ for $i, j, k \in [\mathcal{I}]$.

If $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is not consistent, then there exists a wire $p$ intersecting some segment $S^k_{ij}$ with $i, j, k \in [\mathcal{I}]$. As $\mathcal{I}$ has an elementary floor in $W$, $p$ must intersect the segments $S^{i_0}_{i_1,i_m}$ and $S^{i_m}_{i_0,i_{m-1}}$ by planarity. ∎

To determine the homotopy type of intervals of $B(n, 2)$, we use a stronger version of Proposition 4.1(2).

**Proposition 4.4** *Let $W$ be a simple wiring diagram with inversion set $X$. Let $Y \in B(n, 2)$ such that $X \subseteq Y$. Among the blocks in $Y - X$ with an elementary floor, if $\mathcal{I}$ is of maximum height, then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is consistent.*

*Proof:* Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a difference block of $Y - X$ of maximum height with an elementary floor, and assume $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is not consistent. Replacing $\mathcal{I}$ by a smaller block, we may assume that $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}'}$ is consistent for every block $\mathcal{I}'$ that is a proper subset of $\mathcal{I}$. Let $[\mathcal{I}] = \{i_0, \ldots, i_m\}$ where $i_0 < \cdots < i_m$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists a wire $p$ intersecting the segments $S^{i_0}_{i_1,i_m}$ and $S^{i_m}_{i_0,i_{m-1}}$. By the minimality of $\mathcal{I}$, every such wire intersects the subsegments $S^{i_0}_{i_{m-1},i_m}$ and $S^{i_m}_{i_0,i_1}$; see Figure 4.

Let $P$ be the set of wires intersecting $S^{i_0}_{i_{m-1},i_m}$ and $S^{i_m}_{i_0,i_1}$. If $p \in P$, we claim that $i_0 < p < i_m$ and $\{i_0, p, i_m\}$ is a difference triple in $Y - X$. This follows by restriction of $W$ to the wires $\{i_0, p, i_1, i_m\}$.

Let $F$ denote the region above the wires $i_1, \cdots, i_{m-1}$, below $i_0, i_{m+1}$ and below all of the wires in $P$. As shown in Figure 5, we label the upper edges of $F$ by $g_0, g_1, \ldots, g_q$ which are supported by the wires $i_0 = p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_{q-1} < p_q = i_m$.




Figure 5: The region $F$, edges $g_1, \ldots, g_{q-1}$, and supporting wires $p_1, \ldots, p_{q-1}$ in the proof of Proposition 4.4.

We show by induction that one of the $g_j,\ j \in [q-1]$ is the floor of a difference triple in $Y \setminus X$. We are given that $\{i_0, p_j, i_m\}$ is in $Y$. Suppose $\{p_{j-1}, p_j, i_m\} \in Y$. Using the packet $\{p_{j-1}, p_j, p_{j+1}, i_{m+1}\}$ either $\{p_{j-1}, p_j, p_{j+1}\} \in Y$ or $\{p_j, p_{j+1}, i_m\} \in Y$. The former case has an elementary floor $g_j$. Induction on $j$ completes the argument.

Hence there exists a difference triple $\{p_{j-1}, p_j, p_{j+1}\}$ with an elementary floor. But this triple has height strictly greater than that of $\mathcal{I}$, a contradiction. ∎

**Lemma 4.5** *Let $X \in B(n,2)$ and $\mathrm{Asc}(X) = A_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup A_N$ as in Lemma 3.1. Suppose $|[A_s] \cap [A_t]| \geq 2$ for some $s \neq t$ and assume $\mathrm{ht}(A_s) \leq \mathrm{ht}(A_t)$. Then*

$$[A_s] \cap [A_t] = \{\min[A_t], \max[A_t]\}.$$

*Consequently, $X \cup \overline{A_s}$ is not consistent.*

*Proof:* Let $s, t$ be distinct indices with $|[A_s] \cap [A_t]| \geq 2$ and $\mathrm{ht}(A_s) \leq \mathrm{ht}(A_t)$. Let $i, k \in [A_s] \cap [A_t]$ such that $i < k$. We let $W$ denote a wiring diagram of $X$.

We first show that $\mathrm{ht}(A_s) < \mathrm{ht}(A_t)$. By Lemma 3.1(2) there exists $q \in [A_t] \setminus [A_s]$ such that $i < q < k$. Let $[i,k] \cap [A_s] = \{i = j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_r < j_{r+1} = k\}$ and let $e_\alpha$ be the base of $\{j_{\alpha-1}, j_\alpha, j_{\alpha+1}\}$ for $1 \leq \alpha \leq r$. Since $\{j_{\alpha-1}, j_\alpha, j_{\alpha+1}\}$ is an ascent, each $e_\alpha$ is a segment. Let $e = \bigcup_\alpha e_\alpha$ be the union of these segments. Then $q$ does not intersect $e_\alpha$. If $q$ is above $e_\alpha$, then $\mathrm{ht}(A_s) < \mathrm{ht}(\{i,q,k\}) = \mathrm{ht}(A_t)$ as desired. If $q$ is below $e_\alpha$, then $\mathrm{ht}(A_s) > \mathrm{ht}(\{i,q,l\}) = \mathrm{ht}(A_t)$, contrary to the hypothesis.

Let $p \in [A_t] \setminus \{i,k\}$. It remains to show that $i < p < k$. From this, it follows that $[A_s] \cap [A_t]$ must intersect only at the 2 elements which lie at opposite ends of $[A_t]$.

Suppose to the contrary that $p < i$. Since $\{p, i, l\} \notin X$, $\pi_p(i) < \pi_p(l)$. If $\min[A_s] < i$ then the base of $\{p, i, l\}$ includes the base of an ascent $I$ in $A_s$. By assumption on the height of $A_t$, this implies $I \in A_t$, a contradiction. If $\min[A_s] = i$ then the base of $\{p, i, l\}$ includes the crossing $i \cap j$ where $j = \min([A_s] \setminus i)$. Consequently, $\mathrm{ht}(A_t) \leq \mathrm{ht}(A_s)$, a contradiction.

A symmetric argument shows that $p \not> l$, thus completing the proof. ∎

The following proposition is the key to the proof of Theorem 1.1, as described in the introduction.

**Proposition 4.6** *Let $W$ be a simple wiring diagram with inversion set $X$. Let $Y \in B(n, 2)$ such that $X \subsetneq Y$, and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathrm{Asc}(X, Y)$ such that $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is consistent. If $I_0 \in \mathrm{Asc}(X, Y)$ is of maximum height in $W$, then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I} \cup \{I_0\}}$ is consistent.*

*Proof:* We may assume that $I_0 \notin \mathcal{I}$, as the result is otherwise immediate.

From Lemma 4.5, we know that $\mathcal{I}$ uniquely decomposes as a union of blocks $\mathcal{I}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_m$ such that $|[\mathcal{I}_s] \cap [\mathcal{I}_t]| \leq 1$ for all $s \neq t$. By this decomposition, if $s \neq t$, then no packet contains both a subset of $[\mathcal{I}_s]$ and of $[\mathcal{I}_t]$. Hence $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}_s}$ is consistent for all $s$.

Lemma 3.1 implies that $|I_0 \cap [\mathcal{I}_s]| = 2$ for 0,1, or 2 blocks $\mathcal{I}_s$. We consider each of these cases in turn.

If $|I_0 \cap [\mathcal{I}_s]| \leq 1$ for all $s$, then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I} \cup \{I_0\}} = X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{I_0\}$ is consistent.

Suppose $|I_0 \cap [\mathcal{I}_s]| = 2$ for exactly one block $\mathcal{I}_s$. Then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}_s \cup \{I_0\}}$ is consistent by Proposition 4.4. By Lemma 4.5, we deduce that $|[\mathcal{I}_s \cup \{I_0\}] \cap [\mathcal{I}_t]| \leq 1$ for $t \neq s$, so $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I} \cup \{I_0\}}$ is consistent in this case.

Finally, assume that $|I_0 \cap [\mathcal{I}_s]| = 2$ and $|I_0 \cap [\mathcal{I}_t]| = 2$ for two blocks $\mathcal{I}_s, \mathcal{I}_t$. Then $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}_s \cup \{I_0\} \cup \mathcal{I}_t}$ is consistent by Proposition 4.4. Lemma 4.5 implies that $|[\mathcal{I}_s \cup \{I_0\} \cup \mathcal{I}_t] \cap [\mathcal{I}_u]| \leq 1$ if $u \neq s$ and $u \neq t$. Therefore, $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I} \cup \{I_0\}}$ is consistent.

∎

# 5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $V, W$ be wiring diagrams such that $W$ is simple and $V$ is non-simple. We say $W$ is *incident* to $V$ if $V$ may be obtained by moving the wires of $W$ to a more special position. More precisely, $W$ is incident to $V$ if the associated oriented matroid of $V$ is a weak map image of the oriented matroid associated to $W$; see [3, Section 7.7] for background on weak maps. An interval $(X, Y)$ of $B(n, 2)$ is called *facial* if the closed interval $[X, Y]$ is the set of inversion sets of simple wiring diagrams incident to some fixed wiring diagram.

The following lemma follows from the proof of Lemma 4.5.

**Lemma 5.1** *Let $X, Y \in B(n,2)$ such that $X < Y$. Then $(X,Y)$ is facial if and only if $Y = X \cup \overline{\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)}$ and $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}} \in B(n,2)$ for $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$.*

**Theorem 5.2** *Let $X, Y \in B(n,2)$ such that $X < Y$. If $[X,Y]$ is facial, then $(X,Y)$ is homotopy equivalent to a sphere of dimension $(|\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)|-2)$. Otherwise, $(X,Y)$ is contractible.*

*Proof:* Assume the statement holds for intervals $(X,Z)$ with $X \leq Z < Y$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$(X,Y) \simeq (X,Y)_{nonc}$$

where $(X,Y)_{nonc} = \{Z \in (X,Y) \mid (X,Z) \text{ is not contractible}\}$. Since $B(n,2)$ is ordered by inclusion, $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}} \leq Y$ whenever $\mathcal{I}$ is a subset of $\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$ such that $X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is consistent. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$(X,Y)_{nonc} = \{Z \in (X,Y) \mid (X,Z) \text{ is facial}\}.$$

Suppose $(X,Y)$ is facial. By Lemma 5.1, $Z \in (X,Y)_{nonc}$ if and only if $Z = X \cup \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ for some non-empty proper subset $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$. Hence $(X,Y)_{nonc}$ is the face poset of the boundary of a simplex. Thus, $(X,Y)$ is homotopy equivalent to a sphere of dimension $|\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)| - 2$.

Now assume that $(X,Y)$ is not facial. By Lemma 5.1, $(X,Y)_{nonc}$ is the face poset of a simplicial complex over $\mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$. By Proposition 4.6, this simplicial complex has a cone point $I_0 \in \mathrm{Asc}(X,Y)$, so $(X,Y)_{nonc}$ is contractible. ∎

We let $\omega(n,2)$ denote the set of all wiring diagrams on $n$ wires up to equivalence. This forms a poset under the incidence relation. Alternatively, $\omega(n,2)$ may be viewed as the poset of facial intervals of $B(n,2)$, ordered by inclusion. By Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 5.2, we deduce that $\overline{\omega}(n,2)$ is homotopy equivalent to $\mathbb{S}^{n-3}$. As observed in the introduction, the homotopy type of $\overline{\omega}(n,2)$ was already computed in [14] by other means.

# Acknowledgements

The author thanks Vic Reiner for suggesting this problem and providing many references.

# References

[1] Anders Björner. Orderings of coxeter groups. *Combinatorics and algebra*, 34:175–195, 1984.

[2] Anders Björner. Topological methods. handbook of combinatorics, vol. 1, 2, 1819–1872, 1995.

[3] Anders Björner, Michel Las Vergnas, Bernd Sturmfels, Neil White, and Günter M Ziegler. *Oriented matroids*, volume 46. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[4] Jochen Bohne. *Eine kombinatorische Analyse zonotopaler Raumaufteilungen.* Sonderforschungsbereich 343, 1992.

[5] Aristophanes Dimakis and Folkert Müller-Hoissen. Kp solitons, higher bruhat and tamari orders. In *Associahedra, Tamari Lattices and Related Structures*, pages 391–423. Springer, 2012.

[6] Stefan Felsner and Helmut Weil. A theorem on higher bruhat orders. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 23(1):121–127, 2000.

[7] Andre Henriques and David E Speyer. The multidimensional cube recurrence. *Advances in mathematics*, 223(3):1107–1136, 2010.

[8] Misha M Kapranov and Vladimir A Voevodsky. 2-categories and zamolodchikov tetrahedra equations. In *Proc. Symp. Pure Math*, volume 56, pages 177–260, 1994.

[9] Yurii I Manin and Vadim V Schechtman. Arrangements of hyperplanes, higher braid groups and higher bruhat orders. *Algebraic number theory*, 17:289–308, 1989.

[10] Thomas McConville. *Biclosed sets in combinatorics.* PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, 2015.

[11] Jörg Rambau. A suspension lemma for bounded posets. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 80(2):374 – 379, 1997.

[12] Victor Reiner. The generalized baues problem. *New perspectives in algebraic combinatorics*, 38:293–336, 1999.

[13] Jürgen Richter-Gebert and Günter M Ziegler. Zonotopal tilings and the bohne-dress theorem. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 178:211–211, 1994.

[14] Bernd Sturmfels and Günter M. Ziegler. Extension spaces of oriented matroids. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 10:23–45, 1993.

[15] James W Walker. Homotopy type and euler characteristic of partially ordered sets. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 2(4):373–384, 1981.

[16] James W Walker. Canonical homeomorphisms of posets. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 9(2):97–107, 1988.

[17] Günter M. Ziegler. Higher bruhat orders and cyclic hyperplane arrangements. *Topology*, 32:259–279, 1993.